



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NEGLIGENCE—“LAST CLEAR CHANCE DOCTRINE.”—Plaintiff a messenger in defendant's railroad yards, was sent to the company's roundhouse for materials. The path thereto led over the tracks of the defendant, on which there was a line of box cars with a detached switch engine some ten feet therefrom with a man in the cab. While plaintiff was attempting to pass under the drawheads of the cars across the path, the switch engine backed against the cars, moving them and seriously injuring him. *Held*, (BROWN and WALKER, JJ., dissenting) that the question whether defendant's engineer knew of plaintiff's danger, or might have known thereof by exercising reasonable care, was for the jury, since the “last clear chance doctrine” applies, notwithstanding plaintiff's negligence, where his danger might have been discovered by exercising reasonable care as well as where it was actually discovered. *Edge v. Atlantic Coast Line R. Co.* (1910), — N. C. —, 69 S. E. 74.

The doctrine of “last clear chance”—that the party who last has a clear opportunity of avoiding the accident, notwithstanding the negligence of the other party, is considered solely responsible for it—has been adopted in nearly all jurisdictions. See note, 55 L. R. A., pp. 418-465. Where the accident is due to the failure to exercise ordinary care after the defendant actually discovers the peril, the cases are substantially agreed that the antecedent negligence of the plaintiff will not prevent recovery; but there is considerable difference of opinion as to whether the doctrine should be extended to cases where the peril was not discovered, but might have been by the exercise of ordinary care. In the principal case the North Carolina court takes the view that it should be so extended, and in this it is supported by the following decisions: *Denver City Tramway Co. v. Wright* (1910), 47 Colo. 366, 107 Pac. 1074; *Matz v. Mo. Pac. Ry. Co.* (1910), 217 Mo. 275, 117 S. W. 584; *Phila. & R. Ry. Co. v. Klutt* (1906), 148 Fed. 818; *Louisville & N. R. Co. v. Earl's Adm'x.*, 94 Ky. 368, 22 S. W. 607; while the courts in the following cases have refused to so extend it: *San Antonio Tract. Co. v. Kelleher* (1908), 48 Tex. Civ. App. 421, 107 S. W. 64; *St. Louis S. W. R. Co. v. Cochran* (1906), 77 Ark. 398, 91 S. W. 747; *Sauer v. Eagle Brewing Co.* (1906), 3 Cal. App. 127, 84 Pac. 425; *Dotta v. N. P. Ry. Co.* (1904), 36 Wash. 506, 79 Pac. 32. The dissenting opinion in the principal case was based upon the view that the engineer owed no duty to plaintiff to watch his movements, and therefore it was improper to submit to the jury the question whether, by the exercise of reasonable care, he might have known of plaintiff's danger.

PARENT AND CHILD—CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE OF CUSTODIAN IMPUTED TO PARENT.—A boy of six and his sister, who lacked only ten days of being fourteen years old, attempted to cross defendant's tracks while the crossing gates were down. The girl was bright, intelligent, and familiar with the danger; the boy had been intrusted to her care by the father, who had often warned the girl to be careful in crossing railroad tracks. A train, alleged to have been running too fast, struck the children, without warning, and killed them both. The parents sued, apparently, in their own right, for loss of services, though the report is not clear on this point. *Held*, the presumption that the girl was *non sui juris* was rebutted; she was guilty of contrib-